



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,784	11/02/2001	Kevin A. Marshall	SUNIP749/P5575NP	3211

22434 7590 05/02/2006

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP  
P.O. BOX 70250  
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER

KENDALL, CHUCK O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2192

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**  
**Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/052,784

Applicant(s)

MARSHALL, KEVIN A.

Examiner

Chuck O. Kendall

Art Unit

2192

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 20 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4,5,7-14 and 16-24.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 3,6 and 15.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
**TODD INBERG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding Applicant's comments on page 8, of his 12/20/05 response, that neither Chung nor Smith is directed to monitoring, identifying errors in software programs, Examiner maintains that the prior art does disclose this. As recited in the previous rejection, Chung in Fig. 2, step 201, shows counting the number of lines of code in one or more directories and then scanning the code and then later identifying the faults/errors and analyzing the faults identified in the previous step. In claim 1, Applicant's plain language of claims recites "examining contents of one or more files indicating on or more errors in the software", and this is taught by Chung, as indicated above. Applicant further argues on page 9 of the same response that, Chung can not be applied and doesn't provide motivation to combine with Smith since Chung doesn't disclose monitoring as Examiner has discussed above. Hence since Applicant's arguments are based on an addressed issue (disclosing monitoring and identifying errors), Examiner maintains that Chung is in fact being applied properly and maintains the previous rejection under 35 USC 103. Applicant also further argues on page 9, 4th paragraph, that Ruhlen doesn't disclose "storing modifications made in response to error". Examiner disagrees. Ruhlen in 5:45 - 50, discloses providing error information and being able to handle the error information from a client, using executable instructions running inside the application program module 205 at the time of the failure, Examiner interprets that to be equivalent to modifications made in response to the error. Regarding Applicant's argument that, combining Leung and Hanson with Chung is improper due to Chung's lack of disclosure of monitoring as presented earlier. Please see argument above, which solidifies Chung as being a proper prior art/reference under 103.